

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-37 are pending for consideration by the Examiner. The Examiner's indication that claims 6, 9, 14, 19, and 25-27 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interviews on December 13, 2005 and December 28, 2005 discussing the Final Office action. In the December 28, 2005 interview, the Examiner advised the undersigned that after conferring with a supervisor, the rejections of the claims, including claims directed to the molding of the fuel injector into the intake manifold, could not be sustained based on the cited prior art patent (US 6,412,466). The Examiner advised that a Request for Reconsideration should be filed, and that he would conduct a new search for additional prior art. The Examiner confirmed that any Office action issued based on any newly-found art, would be a non-final Office action.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15-18, 20-24, and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fredriksson, et al. (US 6,412,466). Specifically, the Examiner states that "The patent by Fredriksson, et al. (US 6,412,466) shows an intake manifold (15) with an intake passageway (4, 5, 6, 7, 8). A fuel injector (9) is in communication with the intake passageway. At least a portion of the fuel injector is molded into the intake manifold."

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's argument that Fredriksson, et al. teaches that at least a portion of the fuel injector is molded into the intake manifold. Fredriksson, et al. includes no teaching or suggestion that the injectors 9 are molded into the intake manifold 15. To the contrary, Fig. 4 of Fredriksson, et al. illustrates that the injectors 9 are clearly not molded into the intake manifold at all. As seen in Fig. 4, and as described at col. 3, lines 24-34, an extension part 21 is placed into the fuel hole 18 and the inlet end of the injector is inserted into the extension part 21. A sealing ring 23 is positioned between the extension part 21 and the injector 9 to prevent leakage. Another sealing ring 24 is positioned

between the extension part 21 and the fuel hole 18 to prevent leakage. There is clearly no portion of the fuel injector 9 that is molded into the intake manifold.

For all of these reasons, claims 1-31 are allowable over Fredriksson, et al.

As for independent claim 32, there is no teaching or suggestion in Fredriksson, et al. that the electrical path is at least partially molded into the intake manifold. The injector 9 includes a typical electrical connection 10, but there is no additional discussion regarding the electrical path. There is certainly no teaching or suggestion of any portion of the electrical path molded into the intake manifold.

For all of these reasons, claims 32-37 are allowable over Fredriksson, et al.

The Applicants also re-incorporate all of the additional remarks submitted in the prior response filed August 29, 2005, but have not reproduced them in this Request for Reconsideration in light of the Examiner's comments from the December 28, 2005 interview. For all of these reasons, claims 1-37 are allowable over Fredriksson, et al.

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-37 are respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Richard L. Kaiser". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Richard" and last name "Kaiser" clearly distinguishable.

Richard L. Kaiser
Reg. No. 46,158

File No. 081276-9100-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
(262) 956-6576

X:\clientb\081276\9100\F0188198.1